

REMARKS

Claim 4 is amended herein, and Claims 17-21 are added. In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby provisionally elect Species III (Figure 11) for further prosecution at this time. It is submitted that Claims 3, 4, 8-17, 19 and 21 read upon the elected species, and Claims 3, 4, 8-10 and 21 are believed to be generic to all of Species I, II and III. Further, Claims 3, 4, 8-11, 14-17, 19 and 21 are believed to be generic to both Species II and III.

Claim 4 is amended herein to recite that the roots of the respective pairs of interconnected terminals each have a reduced dimension such that a maximum distance is maintained between laterally adjacent pairs of roots of individual lead frames, so as to read upon all of the embodiments disclosed in this application. Amended Claim 4 is believed allowable over Mclellan as applied in the Office Action dated February 15, 2002, since Mclellan shows a single lead frame in Figures 6a-8b, and does not teach of suggest that the roots of terminals 602 are of a reduced dimension adjacent line 703, which is the area where the lead frame 600 would be connected to adjacent lead frames. Claims 5-10 and added Claims 19 and 20 all depend from Claim 4, and thus are also believed allowable. Claim 3 is believed allowable for the reasons presented in the Response dated June 17, 2002, and thus added Claims 17 and 18 which depend from Claim 3 are believed allowable as presented.

Added Claim 21 is directed to a frame for forming individual semiconductor packages, and recites "each said lead frame having a metal lead which defines a boundary between said lead frame and an adjacent said lead frame, and pairs of terminals project in opposite directions from each said lead disposed between an adjacent pair of lead frames, each said terminal having a root defining a recessed area therein and being disposed closely adjacent and projecting from the corresponding said lead". Mclellan does not teach or suggest

such a recessed area as defined in Claim 21. Further, Ebihara (also applied in the Office Action dated February 15, 2002) teaches openings defined within the die pad or body 1, and does not even remotely suggest the desirability of providing such openings in terminals 1'. Accordingly, no combination of Mclellan and Ebihara would result in the invention of Claim 21. Claim 21 is therefore believed allowable as presented.

Further consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Liane L. Churney

LLC/cc

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL
& TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699
Phone: (269) 381-1156
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel
David G. Boutell
Ronald J. Tanis
Terryence F. Chapman
Mark L. Maki
David S. Goldenberg
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.
Liane L. Churney
Brian R. Tumm
Tricia R. Cobb

Reg. No. 24 323
Reg. No. 25 072
Reg. No. 22 724
Reg. No. 32 549
Reg. No. 36 589
Reg. No. 31 257
Reg. No. 24 949
Reg. No. 40 694
Reg. No. 36 328
Reg. No. 44 621

Encl: Marked-up Version of Amendments
Post Card

136.0112



MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDMENTS

In the Claims:

Claim 4 is amended as follows:

4. (Amended) A frame for forming individual semiconductor packages, said frame comprising a plurality of lead frames arranged in a matrix and semiconductor devices respectively mounted on die pads supported on the individual lead frames by suspending leads, each said lead frame having a metal lead which defines a boundary between said lead frame and an adjacent lead frame, and pairs of terminals project in opposite directions from each said lead disposed between an adjacent pair of lead frames, wherein roots of the respective pairs of interconnected terminals disposed closely adjacent the corresponding lead and projecting outwardly therefrom each have a reduced dimension~~thickness~~ such that a maximum distance is maintained between laterally adjacent pairs of roots of individual lead frames.